HAL VERB
P.O. BOX 421815
S.F., CA. 94142-1815

5-13-95

HAROLD WEISBERG
7627 OLD RECEIVER ROAD
FREDERICK, MD. 21702

Dear Hal:

I had intended to write you much sooner than this but so many things came up I just couldn't do it until now.

As you can see from the many enclosures within this envelope there is a lot to look over. Much of it is, as you & I would readily agree, not well established and really wildly speculative. But, again, it is part of the record & I think you ought to know what is out there being printed.

There is one document which I do believe is important and that is a 38 page document (it is not numbered) by Dr. Doug DeSalles based on my "FIRST SHOT" paper which I delivered at the COPA event last October, 1994 in Washington.

This is a first draft by Doug & he wants me to look it over and comment on it. (You'll see attached to the abstract some of my minor disagreements. Otherwise I think he did a great job — especially on

his analysis of the Bronson film & his establishing that the Bronson still (of the limo) taken at around 2-230 was in reaction to a first shot which had to be around Z-189 to Z-191 & not an earlier shot of Z-160. (I know it is no surprise to you but the number of critics who said an early shot at around Z-160 missed includes Bishop, Groden, Posner, Envica & of course, there is the HSCA comments on this).

I'm still going through Doug's abstract and I'm adding more to his work than he has. I suggested to Doug that we (& whoever else wanted to participate) do a serious documentary video on this first shot evidence & offer it, for example, to the ARRB. Of course, others would be offered the same video. I also suggested a booklet could be written & circulated wherever possible. He thought both ideas good. Doug also wants me to present my expanded version of the "first shot" theory to the next "COPA" event in Washington next October. Of course, I'd be glad to and I think Walt Brown & Aguilar would let myself & Doug present it.

Speaking about the next COPA event, I guess you know that Oliver Stone will be the keynote speaker. (It must be ironic for in Stone's film, he has Garrison stating that the first shot missed).

By the way, mark this down in your calendar - I do intend to be out in the East coast in October &

I will be staying in Washington from Tuesday, Oct. 17 through Monday, Oct. 23rd. The best times for me to see you would be, of course, either Wed., Oct. 18 or Thursday, Oct. 19. Those would be the only days I can do this. I hope this will work out for you.

Enclosed within are all the articles I could find on Mailer's book on Oswald. In case you didn't have a copy of the "New Yorker" article, I enclosed it. You'll note that the "N.Y. Review of Books" prints a Mailer article on Ruby but doesn't state it is from Mailer's book! An oversight, or ---??

By the way, I finally figured out who the individual is when you mentioned to me that you thought his name began with a "K". The name must be: Paul Kangas. His most recent address I have is: P.O. Box 422644, S.F., CA. 94142. The phone numbers (which appear to be answering numbers only are: #415-890-0453 & #415-991-8448).

Kangas & I do not get along very well together ever since I exposed him as a deceitful fraud when he & others had a meeting at Aguilar's office. Aguilar after that exposure will have nothing to do with him.

Kangas has a post office box at the same post office building where I pick up my mail. At first he was openly hostile towards me but in our few encounters he is cordial enough.

I also ran into Kangas at a talk given by Norman Mailer here in S.F. on May 8th. Kangas, in the audience, had asked Mailer if he had seen Stone's film "JFK" & what he thought of it. Of course, I knew that Mailer had seen it & written about it for "Vanity Fair". Obviously Kangas was totally unaware of this. But Kangas doesn't read up on the case. Once in a confrontation at the post office when he and I were picking up our mail, he accused me of being "a rat fink" & when I discussed something about some evidence in the Warren Report he actually ~~[illegible]~~ boasted to me that he had never read either the Warren Report or the Commission's volumes. To add to this invincible ignorance he then stated to me that Oswald wasn't an important figure in the whole case, anyway!!

That's the kind of person Kangas is so if you do contact him anything he says cannot be trusted.

By the way at that Mailer 5/8/95 talk I got to ask him a question & I was debating his points about Oswald being the lone assassin & Oswald not being a U.S. agent. The audience was hostile towards me (It was a very adulatory audience & they, apparently, didn't like to see one of their literary giants tarnished in any manner).

Mailer's less than adequate reply to me was to state he still believed Oswald did it & that he saw no evidence to indicate Oswald was an agent. At the very end of his reply to me, he asked "If you have any evidence to show he was an agent, I'd like to see it!" At that I shouted out loud: "I'll see you later!"

I did see him afterwards (he autographed the book for me). I gave him two articles I had written (which were on my "first shot" evidence and the other article was on the evidence for two simultaneous shots to the head (the fatal shots). But I also gave him a note indicating my strong disapproval of his handling the Oswald New Orleans radio debate. I pointed out that on page 590 he had entirely omitted Oswald's "I was under the protection of the U.S." remark. (Mailer's book has three dots indicating something left out). In my strong note to him, I asked: "Aren't you just as guilty as the Warren Commission as having left out vital evidence?"

You might also be interested in knowing that Mailer was on a KGO station being interviewed. A researcher friend of mine (Bill O'Neil) who also attended the Mailer talk said he taped it & will send me a copy. Bill said Mailer was making the most ridiculous statements about the case & was not being accurate for his remarks. Bill will send me a copy of the tape & when I get it, I'll

send you a copy. I know you're writing a book on Mailer & it should be useful.

I also thought it rather interesting that after Mailer lambasted Posner in Dallas last year. He said Posner was a "sloppy writer" & "cut corners". In addition he said Posner got Oswald's attempted suicide in Russia incident all wrong. Yet, despite all this, who does Mailer use as a reference point? None other than Posner! And, of course, he also cites Epstein & MacMillan as authorities. The final blow is his use of Schiller. With "friends" like this, who needs enemies?!!

I'll close now with a few more notes on things you may ponder on:

(1) NBC contacted me (from their Burbank TV studio). They wanted to see some of the videos I'm doing for my 14 hour series ("Assassination Update"). I sent them two videos — one on the JFK case & the other on Malcolm X. They sent them back to me — said they weren't interested. They wrote = "Your material wasn't right for our show." This is about the standard & stock reply I've gotten whenever I try to get into mainstream media.

Walt Brown told me that Dick Russell's book has been cancelled by Carroll & Graf.

By the way although I put in an order for your book, "Never Again", from my local

book-store, they said there was still no word except that it would be out in May. As of 5/13/95 still no word it has come in.

One final note: while reading a book, "For THE PRESIDENT'S EYES ONLY" by Christopher Andrew, I came across this = "The CIA assessment of Oswald was prepared by Arthur Dooley, dated March 20, 1964 (declassified August 1993)."

I've not heard of Dooley - have you? According to the dust jacket blurb the author Andrew is described as a "guest lecturer" at the CIA.

Well, that is about all for now. I want to get all this in the mail to you.

Best,

Hal Verb